

Date: Tue, 12 Jul 94 22:37:18 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #781
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 12 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 781

Today's Topics:

 2M opening to Hawaii de CA.
 6M Warnings
 BIOEFFECTS ALL OF 9
 Does CW as a pre-req (2 msgs)
 Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?
 For Washington Hams re Towers
 Repeater frequencies in IO, MN, MI et IL (2 msgs)
 th78e and antenna tv !!!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Jul 1994 12:33:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 2M opening to Hawaii de CA.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jul11.224615.1@vax.sonoma.edu>,
 harrisok@vax.sonoma.edu writes:

> Oh am I jazzed! I just worked Hilo, Hawaii on 2 meters via our club repeater
> here in Sonoma County, CA. The first time I worked Hawaii and it was VHF!

Upgrade to General and you can work people even farther away than that.

MD

--
-- The best way for Bill Clinton to keep his
-- legal fees down is to keep his zipper up.
--

Date: 12 Jul 1994 14:26:56 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!newsfeed.gsfc.nasa.gov!bolt.gsfc.nasa.gov!
user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 6M Warnings
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Watch TV Channel 2 or 3! Listen to 28.885 for real DX info.also. There also
may be a local 2 meter simplex freq as we have here in DC area. Dick W1DGA

Date: Tue, 12 Jul 1994 11:50:00 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ub!acsu.buffalo.edu!ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu!
oopdavid@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: BIOEFFECTS ALL OF 9
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

June 1, 1994

George S. Wilson, III, W4OYI
1649 Griffith Avenue
Owensboro, Kentucky 42301

Dear Mr. Wilson:

The ARRL Bio-Effects Committee writes this letter to detail the series
of events leading up to what has developed into an unnecessarily
difficult situation to all parties involved. It is not without a certain
degree of sadness and disappointment that the Committee feels required
to do this recounting, but we feel that the record has become unclear,
and it is only appropriate that a correct account be established.

The current membership of the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee was appointed
by Larry Price, W4RA, in January, 1990 with the distinctive charge of
revitalizing organized amateur radio's concern for the limitation of
potential bio-effects hazards that might arise from the participation of
individuals in the hobby of amateur radio. The members of the Committee

were W. Ross Adey, M.D., K6UI, David Rodman, M.D., KN2M, Thomas Rozzell, Sc.D., WB4ZTT, Samuel Milham, M.D., and Ivan Shulman, M.D., WC2S as Chairman. Wayne Overbeck, Ph.D., J.D., N6NB was appointed as Board Liaison. Since that time, the Committee has worked to re-write virtually all the sections pertaining to bio-effects hazards in all the ARRL publications offered to the public. In addition, the Committee has monitored and reported to the Board on current projects that the Committee has been involved in, including the FCC-EPA study of field strength measurements at various amateur radio installations in Southern California.

In January, 1992 the Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee wrote to you regarding the appointment of Wayne Overbeck as a full Committee member, as he was no longer on the Board as a Vice-Director. The Chairman also wrote regarding the appointment of a new Board Liaison. The Chairman received no direct response from you in this matter, but was later advised that Mr. Overbeck had been appointed to the Committee after much deliberation.

The Chairman had not been consulted nor advised as to Mr. Price's appointment as Board Liaison until April, 1992, when a copy of a letter that was sent to an amateur expressing concern regarding the safety of amateur radio operation arrived at the Chairman's desk over the signature of Mr. Price, speaking for the Committee. The Chairman voiced his objections to Jay Holladay, W6EJJ, concerning this unilateral action on the part of Mr. Price, as being an inappropriate role for the Board Liaison to take without consultation with at the least the Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman heard nothing further regarding this matter.

In April, 1992, QST published a photograph and description of an antenna disguised as a curtain rod as a "cute" item to show the cooperative effort of a ham and his new bride. This was not accompanied by any disclaimer as to the inadvisability of the risks of the operation of such a station due to potential bio-effects issues. When the Committee objected to this, a letter from the Chairman was published in QST with the headline "Indoor Antenna: RF Hazard?", with the question mark implying to the Committee that there was editorial doubt as to the veracity of the observations expressed in the letter on behalf of the Committee. The last word on this matter was had by the original operator, W6REF in a letter headlined "Bioeffects Overkill," criticizing the stance of the Chairman as being unreasonable because the power levels being generated at this installation were not known. Such an editorial disregard for the basic tenets that the Committee has espoused seems rather cavalier and inappropriate. The less than subtle captioning of each of these letters, and the lack of editorial insight into the entire issue was very disturbing.

Early in 1993, the FCC issued Docket 93-62, an NPRM regarding the adoption of the ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992 guidelines on bio-effects. One would expect that the ARRL, as the largest representative of amateur radio operators in this country, would seek the broadest base of opinion from which to develop a position in this matter. Certainly, one would expect that the Bio-Effects Committee would be the appropriate body within the ARRL from which the League would seek such counsel. Even as of this late date, no such request for information from the Bio-Effects Committee has been made.

Failing to receive such an invitation to provide the League with information and advice in this very important matter, members of the Bio-Effects Committee developed a document suggesting a position to be taken by the League in what the Committee expected to be a filing before the FCC. This was sent to the League in November, 1993. The Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee received absolutely no response from the League on this issue. Mr. Overbeck received a communication from the League acknowledging receipt of the document, but nothing further was heard by any member of the Bio-Effects Committee after that time.

Because of the importance of this matter, and because nothing was sent to advise the authors of the document of a position the League was going to adopt, and because no further input from the Committee had been solicited, and because a deadline in January, 1994 was rapidly approaching, and because of their deep personal and professional concern regarding the importance of this issue, some members of the Bio-Effects Committee made an independent filing to the FCC as individuals, specifically indicating that they were not speaking from their position as members of the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee, but as private citizens.

In February, 1994, the Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee received a call from Jim Maxwell, W6CF advising that he had been appointed to the position as Board Liaison. Again, the Chairman of the Committee had not been consulted regarding this appointment, not did he receive the courtesy of formal advisement of this from anyone at the League other than Mr. Maxwell himself.

On February 16, 1994, a meeting was held between Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Holladay and the Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee, reviewing concerns expressed at League headquarters regarding the FCC filing by members of the Committee. During this meeting, a long series of MCI communications was reviewed, at which time several issues were clearly established.

1. There had never been a request from anyone at the League for the opinion of the Bio-Effects Committee, soliciting input on the NPRM in question.
2. After receipt of the unsolicited comments of the members of the

Bio-Effects Committee in November, 1994, there was never a reply to the Chairman of the Committee, nor was there any further communication with the Committee by anyone at the League regarding the position to be adopted by the League in their filing. Specifically, no draft of the League's filing was sent to the Committee for comments nor review. The Committee was kept completely in the dark with regard to the League's filing and was not informed in any manner as to any position to be adopted by the League in this matter.

3. Other issues regarding the complete failure of League management to consult with the Committee on proposed QST articles, such as the piece on pacemakers published last year, as well as the episode with the aforementioned antenna were documented.
4. The complete lack of consultation on the appointment of Board Liaison was documented, including the absence of the common courtesy of a formal letter from anyone at the League regarding these appointments.
5. Regret and dismay was expressed to the Chairman regarding these shortcomings and it was stated that these events should not have occurred.

At the close of this meeting, a positive feeling of trust and understanding between the parties appeared to have been established, and Mr. Maxwell expressed a clear desire to improve the communications between the League and the Chairman and members of the Bio-Effects Committee. It is clear however, that this feeling was not reciprocated by others at the League.

On March 1, 1994, the Chairman and the members of the Committee who signed the independent citizen's filing received a FedEx letter, with your stamped signature advising us of your distress in the entire matter of our filing. In the letter you made several statements which strike the members of the Committee as deserving of comment.

While the members of the Committee have no problem with the desire of the League to appear to speak with one voice on matters before governmental agencies, it is absolutely clear to all except for you, that our filing was "as individuals, and not as representatives of the League". As evidence to support the contention that it is a rather peculiar view to see this filing as a separate voice of the League, is the report by Fred Maia in his W5YI Report of February 1, 1994, clearly restating that these members were speaking as individuals, and not as the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee itself, nor on behalf of the League.

Further adding to the aggravation of members of the Committee is your

statement that "members cited their membership on the Committee to bolster their competency to speak to the subject". That you should feel that Drs. Adey or Milham or any other member of the Bio-Effects Committee need the ARRL to establish or burnish their credentials and competency to speak to anyone on this subject is outrageous and insulting.

The absence of a report to the ARRL Board in July, 1993 is an irrelevant issue. In the form letter sent to Committee Chairmen by Mr. Sumner, there is no demand for such a report, and indeed there is no stated charge in any document to support a contention that such a report is mandatory. The Chairman of the Committee is fully aware that reports to the Board can be useful, but the then current activities of this Committee had not changed from the previous report. Furthermore, as clearly established above, there was no request from the League nor the Board to provide anyone with any information regarding the NPRM, so the Committee had not addressed the issue at that time.

The connection between the filing and your decision to dismiss Mr. Overbeck from the Committee is lost on all of the members of this Committee. The full and sole responsibility for the authorization of the "independent filing" is that of the individual who happens to be the Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee and not that of Mr. Overbeck. As such, it should fall to that individual to bear the full burden of that decision. That Mr. Overbeck is, in the opinion of the Committee itself, the member best able to put the scientific thoughts and concepts of the Committee in legal terms does not place him solely responsible for the actions that follow the expression of those ideas. It appears that the decision to dismiss him is based upon matters which accompanied the reluctance of individuals at the League to appoint him to the Committee in the first place. Furthermore, these appear to relate to events that occurred outside this Committee, and that preceded this appointment by several years. In our opinion, these prior events should have nothing to do with the current situation.

It should be noted that those members of the Committee who signed the filing were not aware of, and had never been advised of any League policy regarding the independent expression of the views of Committee members, particularly in the absence of any objection expressed to our filing by anyone at the League. Furthermore, Mr. Holladay himself was at a loss to provide the Chairman of the Committee with any formal charge by the League for an ARRL Committee of its duties, until such a document was sent to the Chairman long after the February 16 meeting.

The Committee does feel that the strength of its membership and the authority with which its members are internationally acknowledged to be experts in this field has been ignored by the League in matters of concern. In fact, your term "window dressing" may well be appropriate.

There can be no reason other than a desire for "window dressing" to explain the complete absence of any request from the League for information from the Committee regarding this NPRM, the most important governmental proposal that the League has ever had to address on this subject. It appears only logical that the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee might well have been among the first sources of in-house assistance that League officials would have consulted in this matter. As further events have proved, this was not to be the case. The subsequent lack of any substantive communication from the League to the Committee once the Committee's document had been received by the League in November further supports the contention that the views of the Committee have been regarded as superfluous and unwelcome, and perhaps even a liability to any League filing. Furthermore, despite recent promises to improve communications between the League and the Committee, the Committee has even been excluded from the development of a League response during the recently concluded time for reply comments on this NPRM.

Since receipt of your March 1 letter, the Chairman of the Bio-Effects Committee has had repeated communications with Messrs. Holladay, Maxwell, Heyn and Olson in an effort to find a common ground to enable to committee to function once again. The Committee feels that despite the good offices and the best efforts of the aforementioned individuals, the absence of any willingness on your part to directly engage in a dialogue with the Committee to be very disturbing, and is seen as evidence of your lack of understanding of the strong feelings which have been aroused by your actions and those of the League in matters pertaining to the Committee.

Regardless of expectations that the Committee might immediately respond to your March 1 letter in an angry or non-constructive manner, the Committee has instead patiently waited for any sign that some degree of understanding and a desire for a positive resolution of this matter on the part of the League or yourself might be forthcoming. Numerous discussions have been held between the Chairman, members of the Committee and Mr. Maxwell. We have refused to be drawn into a situation where a favorable end result might be impossible. Apparently, we have waited in vain, as nothing appears to have changed.

The only hopeful sign of progress came on the evening of May 1, 1994, when the Chairman of the Committee received a call from Mr. Olson indicating that the Chairman could expect a call from you shortly thereafter, suggesting that you wished to discuss this more directly with the Committee. This information was further corroborated by Mr. Maxwell about a week later. As of this date, a month later, no such telephone call has been received.

The members of the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee plan to continue to contribute to an understanding by amateur radio operators of the issues

relating to the potential bio-hazards of our activities as radio operators, and as such will remain active in our continued review of information and research in this field as it becomes available. We plan to remain available to any and all amateur radio operators who seek our counsel. We further plan to continue to speak out in matters that concern us as individuals and as private citizens as they pertain to our deep and fundamental interest in amateur radio.

We will however, not allow our names to be subject to the political machinations and narrow views of individuals who seek to use us for their own aims or as "window dressing" for you or the League. It would be unfortunate for all amateur radio operators to suffer the repercussions of such a short-sighted view of things, particularly when they may result in long-term negative consequences to amateur radio as a whole. There has been a loss of confidence on the part of the members of the Committee in that you, as President of the League, are clearly not concerned with the continued successful functioning of this Committee, unfettered by extra-scientific and parochial influences. In addition, it is felt that your actions have subjected both the scientific as well as personal integrity of the members to serious compromise. There appears to be no reason that individuals who serve as unpaid volunteers to the League should be subject to such abuse.

We have considered the consequences of our resignation both as individuals and as a Committee as a whole. We stand together united in a common view that you do not see importance of this Committee as originally constituted, that under your leadership, the League has ignored the important resources that the Committee has to offer to all of amateur radio, and that you personally fail to understand the issues of personal integrity that this entire situation has raised.

Therefore, it is with the deepest of regrets that we find that we must submit our resignations as the ARRL Bio-Effects Committee forthwith.

[Signatures by Chairman Shulman of all members]

cc: Fried Heyn, WA6WZO
Jay Holladay, W6EJJ
Jim Maxwell, W6CF
Tod Olson, K0TO
David Sumner, K1ZZ

Date: 12 Jul 1994 12:37:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Does CW as a pre-req
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2vtve0\$1su@theopolis.orl.mmc.com>,
jcarter@orl.mmc.com (James Carter) writes:

|> 1. If this is true then how do they get away with no-code HF in Japan???

We could opt out of our START treaties by just saying so too.

The US already has no-code HF access. 27mhz.

|> 2. We're in the computer age now and manual code is no longer needed.

Computers don't receive code very good.

|> 3. I also think before long no-code no-code licenses will outnumber all
|> others. It's just a matter of time.

Probably. The US population today always wants something for nothing.
In this case, an amateur license with no work required.

MD

--

-- The best way for Bill Clinton to keep his
-- legal fees down is to keep his zipper up.

--

Date: 12 Jul 1994 11:39:44 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
cs.umd.edu!news.coop.net!news.den.mmc.com!iplmail.orl.mmc.com!mccartney!
jcarter@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Does CW as a pre-req

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 2426@channel1.com, alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

>JS>Because the IRU treaty that governs ham radio operations worldwide
>JS>forbids it for now. Until the treaty is changed, knowledge of morse
>JS>code is required to access frequencies below 30MHz.

1. If this is true then how do they get away with no-code HF in Japan???

2. We're in the computer age now and manual code is no longer needed.

3. I also think before long no-code no-code licenses will outnumber all others.
It's
just a matter of time.

0 0 000 0 0 000 00 0 0 | James A. Carter | Jcarter@orl.mmc.com
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | FCC Lic. KD4PON | These views are my own and
00 0 0 0000 000 0 0 0 00 | | are in no way connected
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 00 | Martin Mariettia | to MARTIN MARIETTIA.
0 0 000 0 0 00 0 0 | Orlando, FL 32855 | Thanks Jim

Date: 12 Jul 1994 12:30:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <381@doghouse.win.net>,
jsalemi@doghouse.win.net (Joe Salemi) writes:

|> Well, sorry you're so cynical about a system that's been working and
|> working well for 10 years.

Working well. Guess it all depends on your definition of "well".

|> Have you ever actually been a VE? I am,
|> and I know that the vast majority are honest and care about what they
|> do.

Yes, I was a VE, for a little while. Now I can't be part of a system
which I despise.

|> Instead of advocating trashing the
|> whole system, why not join it and work inside it to make sure it's
|> honest? It's not going to change anytime soon.

There is no way to "work inside" it. And, the FCC has made abundantly
clear that they have no interest in the amateur radio service anymore.
Why should I care?

MD

--
-- The best way for Bill Clinton to keep his
-- legal fees down is to keep his zipper up.
--

Date: 12 Jul 1994 13:06:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!nigel.msen.com!ilium!gdls.com!

usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: For Washington Hams re Towers
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Last week I purchased a home in Enumclaw, King County. Changing jobs is the reason for going there.

In travelling the area in search of a house I did not see one ham antenna, or one tower, although there are 83 hams in Enumclaw, and I found out later 8 on my street! I thought this kind of strange, but let it pass. I talked to the building department in Enumclaw about towers, and they said that I could do whatever I wanted, they didn't care. But we found out that although the home has an Enumclaw address, it's really in King county. I got the phone number of the King County building department, but it's been continually busy.

Question I have is are there any county-wide restrictions on towers in King county? Is there anything else that I should know?

Appreciate any information. See you on the air.

73

Bill

en, KF0YJ, DN-70-EE

Date: 12 Jul 1994 11:55:01 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!jussieu.fr!univ-lyon1.fr!
elendir@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Repeater frequencies in IO, MN, MI et IL
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi !

I'll be travelling this summer (between July 23rd and August 15th) in the northern part of the US [Des-Moines, Minneapolis, Chicago and Detroit].

I have had my TH 78E modified, the CTCSS unit installed and I've received the reciprocal permit.

I am therefore interested in knowing the frequencies and access tones of the UHF repeaters in the area. I seldom do VHF, but I might be interested also.

Thanks, Vince.

PS : Is it possible to buy a cheap 13.8 V power supply, in order to charge the batteries ? Of course I've got one, but it works with 220 V.

--

F1RCS - Worldwide Friendship through Amateur Radio
ENST, Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Telecommunications, Paris

Date: 12 Jul 1994 14:25:14 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!jussieu.fr!
univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Repeater frequencies in IO, MN, MI et IL
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

William J. Turner (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:

: I have no idea where "IO" is, but Des Moines is in IOWA (IA).

: As for freqs in the DSM area, try 443.400+ (PL 151.4). This one seems
: to get the most activity here. Other repeaters I know of include
: 443.500+, 444.050+, 444.150+, 444.350+, 444.500+, 444.575+, 444.625+.

: These may not all be in Des Moines, but in surrounding areas, also. I
: believe they are all open repeaters. (If any require a PL tone, it is
: 151.4)

Ok, thanks. I thought the code for Iowa was IO and not IA :-)
BTW, what is the shift for US repeaters ? 1.6 MHz ?

Vincent

--

F1RCS - Worldwide Friendship through Amateur Radio
ENST, Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Telecommunications, Paris

Date: 12 Jul 1994 07:12:37 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!scorpion.ch.intel.com!
cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: th78e and antenna tv !!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2vqss5\$2st@c700-2.sm.dsi.unimi.it>,
Fabio MUCINGHIA II Morandi <morandi@c700-2.sm.dsi.unimi.it> wrote:
>i have a problem !!!
>a man that live near my house, say that, when i tal with my radio, him

>tv is disturb !!!! is it possible ???? Fabio (IW2HNP)

Hi Fabio, is his TV FCC approved?... just kidding. You did not say what frequency you are on but if you are on HF, get a low-pass filter for you and a high-pass filter for him. It is possible that the design of his TV is so bad, nothing you can do can help. I wait until all my neighbors go to sleep and then work DX.

Good Luck and 73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #781
